

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 044

SP 033 783

AUTHOR Bercik, Janet T.
TITLE School Based/University Collaborative Effort: A Pre Service Model.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (16th, Houston, TX, November 21-26, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Northeastern Illinois University

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the principles and describes the planning and development of a student teaching program model for Northeastern Illinois University students. The program is in its fourth year and was collaboratively designed by faculty from the university and a local middle school. The model is based on the importance of communication, understanding, and trust between the school participants, the university coordinator, and the college students. The triad maintains a constant dialogue and shares decision making, with each component having the power to implement teaching methods and strategies. Among the features of the program are a school-based seminar for cooperating teachers and student teachers, focusing on topics suggested by the participants, and action research projects carried out jointly by student teachers and cooperating teachers. The appendices include a list of seminar topics, responses of student and cooperating teachers to year-end evaluation questions, and lists of clinical experiences which student teachers had and of those they would like to have. (IAH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED346044

SCHOOL BASED / UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIVE EFFORT:
A PRE SERVICE MODEL

Dr. Janet T. Bercik
Clinical Experiences Coordinator
Northeastern Illinois University

National Council of States on Inservice Education
Sixteenth Annual National Conference
*"Meeting the Challenge - Facing the Issues -
Empowering People!"*

Hyatt Regency West Houston
Houston, Texas
November 22 - 26 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet T. Bercik

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

jtb/1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

School Based / University Collaborative Effort:

A Pre Service Model

Dr. Janet T. Bercik
Northeastern Illinois University

"Let's go for it!" Those four words led to collaboration between a middle school principal and me inaugurating a joint field experience project in her school. Sharing similar beliefs about teaching and future teachers, we did not foresee what has now become an exciting program for the school's students, the cooperating teachers, my college students, and us.

Historically, the methods by which teachers received preparation varied from the apprenticeship model in the Middle Ages to the establishment of the first normal school at Theims, France, by Jean Baptiste de la Salle, the Father of Student Teaching.

Today, research in the area of field based experiences is limited and seldom addresses the issues that are important to teacher preparatory institutions. There is a renewed interest in these fields as Colleges of Education examine their programs, prompted by criticism that teachers entering the profession are not properly prepared.

The variety and effectiveness of these programs is realized by reading the latest information in the Association of Teacher Educators and Donald Cruickshank's books. Their findings should incite educators to search, assess, rewrite, and provide new and expanded experiences for future teachers.

As a veteran teacher, I questioned the process involved in the preparation of future teachers, and now as a university instructor look at the best methods to help and mentor clinical and student teachers. In questioning the pedagogical and theoretical knowledge bases we employed, I became curious about the consistency of the programs our students underwent and how they were monitored. This led to my belief that it is necessary to take into account the words that John Dewey stated in 1938. These thoughts were incorporated into the present model, now in its fourth year:

A primary responsibility of educators is that they not only be aware of the general principle of the shaping of actual experience by environing conditions but that they also recognize in the concrete what surroundings are conducive to having experiences that lead to growth. Above all, they should know how to utilize the surroundings, physical and social, that exist so as to extract from them all that they have to contribute to building up experiences that are worthwhile. [Dewey, 1938, p.35]

The structure, for this model, was built on the research results gleaned from an experienced teachers questionnaire [Blair & Bercik, 1989], a pilot study of new teachers [Bercik & Blair, 1989], and discussions with the principal and the school's teacher coordinator. The model is based on the importance of communication, understanding, and trust between the school participants, the university coordinator, and the college students. This triad maintains a continued and ongoing dialogue, with no one force being a final decision maker, each having its own parameters, and each having the power to implement teaching methods and knowledge base strategies. As assessment of the program has been ongoing we are now beginning to realize the benefits and ramifications of the program.

In the first year, we developed a loosely structured program that involved students beginning at any point during the first two weeks of the semester, meeting with the principal or the coordinator, and finally moving into their assignment. Seminars were held **without** faculty interaction. Evaluation of the first year, by the teachers and college students, led the principal and I to look at what, in fact, occurred.

After a planning meeting between the principal, teacher coordinator, and me, we decided that all students would meet their cooperating teachers at a general meeting **before** starting in the classrooms. The parameters and requirements for all the participants would be explained so there would be clarity and understanding between the college students and their cooperating teachers. A list of possible seminar topics would be placed before the faculty, voted upon, and the top eight topics chosen for presentation. This allowed them to volunteer and discuss a topic they felt comfortable to address (see Appendix A).

The teachers felt comfortable with this second year format, so we continued the process into the third year. However, a new component was added that involved teacher/college student collaborative research. This was included by the university instructor as an impetus to encourage teachers to become participants in action research. This would provide the teachers and the students an additional avenue for communication and increase their involvement in classroom decision making.

We are now in our fourth year of the program and though the key components of the program are still intact, growth has been our major focus. We have included two additional ideas that were suggested by the teachers. One involves a handbook for cooperating teachers and college students developed by a committee comprised of the principal, a college student, three teachers and me. The second involves a midsemester meeting between the cooperating teachers and me to discuss those issues they feel important, and to review their college student's development.

Students and teachers evaluate the entire experience at the conclusion of each year (see Appendixes B and C). On the basis of these evaluations the program was restructured with components added that would benefit both the cooperating teachers and the college students. This progressive design is what has enabled us to see an outright eagerness on the part of the entire staff to participate, their openness to share expertise and knowledge of teaching with the students, and a broadened awareness of teaching and the teaching process (see Appendix D).

The program's emphasis is concerned with the students' growth and development as pre-service teachers which is realized through bi-monthly seminars and their logs. During this time frame, students receive support from peers and their university supervisor, and the creation of a knowledge base relative to the specific topics. Coupled with the classroom teacher's practical knowledge, this provides the college students with a framework to merge theory and practice. This process also provides the novice with an insight into the importance of how one must adjust the curriculum to the students. It allows them to focus on the program's integration of curriculum, management strategies, and instructional goals so they are not viewed as separate entities, but as those parts necessary to complete the whole.

From observation, the principal has confirmed that this collaborative effort provided her school with several important components that we had not anticipated. She acknowledged that her school received and benefitted in the development of the following;

1. **Trust building** - teachers felt they could make suggestions and I would use and implement them; they saw the students as adjuncts within the classroom and considered them coworkers, thereby establishing positive relationships; and finally, they felt they had input into a vital aspect of teacher training and education.
2. **Self interest gains** - teachers saw this as a plus for their classrooms, "having an extra pair of hands" that understood the process.
3. **Good employment training** - the entire building was utilized as an on site training model, that included any participants within the school setting.

4. **Revitalization of the faculty** - the inclusion of the faculty in deciding and participating in the seminar topics caused them to reflect on what and why they were using a particular strategy; they saw the fruits of their labor as students used these strategies and techniques successfully thereby providing a general, healthy growth for the entire culture and structure of the school organization.
5. **Self evaluation** - caused discussion among the faculty about the strategies they were using and how best to share it with their college student; they spent time addressing the issue of why they did a particular activity and then trying to present and fine tune it for replication by a novice; and finally it provided them with the opportunity to pass on their knowledge, creating growth for them as teachers and as mentors. It was a "passing of the torch."

The utilization of this model for a collaborative effort is contingent upon three fundamentals: first, that school personnel are amenable to sharing their expertise; second, that the administration be willing to discuss all issues and plan cooperatively; and third, that the university faculty respect the knowledge base of the school and build upon that framework.

The heart and soul of this model program has been the successful expenditure of time, effort, and energy. Its success has been determined by those involved and the application of definite principles which are:

- There must be ongoing dialogue between the teacher and student participants and continuous feedback from both.
- There must be a commitment from the university personnel and the school faculty.
- There must be the understanding that, over time, mutual respect and trust is developed. It is crucial for all participants to realize, that this will not be accomplished in one year but over several.
- There must be continuous review of the program by all participants.
- There must be flexibility within the program.
- There must be a willingness to share and explore new ideas, methods, strategies, and ways to improve teacher education.

- The college students must understand that the school site is providing an important educational foundation to their program, that the teachers are the experts, and that their university is providing the catalyst to help bridge the gap between the theory and practice of teaching.

Another component of this program is to provide data necessary for universities and schools to assess their roles. The final analysis is dependent upon its members analyzing their influence and interaction upon several factors:

- an evaluation of the personal characteristics and abilities necessary for successful completion of teacher education programs;
- an evaluation of the impact that early field experience programs and student teaching have on the beginning teacher;
- an evaluation of the skills necessary to become mentors;
- an assessment of teaching methods and strategies and how to transmit these to others;
- a critical evaluation of the curriculum of teacher education programs and the process of integrating theory with reality; and
- the development of teachers who are reflective decision makers.

For any program this is a tall order, but each step builds upon the other. The movement starts with the building of trust and gives birth to necessary support, this leads to joint evaluations that strenghtens the participants' commitment, ending in issues that are addressed and solved.

This school/university collaborative effort may be adjusted to meet the needs of any situation as long as the participants are willing to be open and communicate with one another. The program is designed to provide the necessary experiences at the clinical level creating a strong foundation for the prospective teacher. It is within this foundation that is found the needed assistance and support for prospective teachers during their student teaching. This program is advanced for the development of future teachers as professionals.

References

- Blair, S. & Bercik, J.T. Teacher induction: A survey of experienced teachers. ERIC Document No. ED 304 455. Summer, 1989.
- Bercik, J.T. & Blair, S. A perspective of new teachers and their induction year at a major urban parochial school system. ERIC Document No. ED 304 406. Spring, 1989.
- Cruikshank, D.R. Research that informs teachers and teacher educators. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1990.
- Houston, W. Robert. [Ed.]. Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the association of teacher educators. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1990.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Seminar Meeting Topics

1. Reading formation [traditional]
2. Reading formation using thematic units or novels
3. Discipline / classroom management issues
4. Lesson plan development
5. Parental involvement / grade reporting / conferencing
6. Use of technology in the schools
7. Special needs child in the classroom / school
8. Project Adventure
9. Job Hunting Hints
10. Homework issues
11. Content Areas / new ideas / integration with reading
12. Student Assessment / Why and how do we do it?
13. Professional responsibilities
14. Action research in the classroom

APPENDIX B

YEAR ONE / YEAR TWO / YEAR THREE

ITEMS	STUDENT RESPONSES			LIKERT SCALE
-------	-------------------	--	--	--------------

1. School provided me with a variety of experiences.....	5.0	4.71	4.83-----
2. These experiences will be of use to me when I go into student teaching.....	5.0	4.86	4.83-----
3. The overall experience at this school was worthwhile.....	5.0	4.86	5.0-----
4. My CT would be an asset to other CE students.....	5.0	4.86	5.0-----
5. My UI gave me support during this experience.....	5.0	5.0	4.83-----
6. The seminars were worthwhile & coordinated the overall experience.....	4.71	5.0	4.50-----

The majority of my time was spent in:

7. observation =	4.71	4.5	2.5
8. individual tutoring =	3.57	4.0	3.17
9. small group interaction =	4.0	4.25	4.00
10. whole group lessons =	3.71	4.0	3.33

APPENDIX C

GLEN GROVE TEACHER RESPONSES

Year One = no formalized questionnaire

YEARS TWO [a] AND THREE [b] / QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Discuss the positive aspects of the program.
 - [a] benefits to both
"Students add certain richness to the school community." "It has provided me with more hands in the room." "Helps keep my program focused."
 - [b] lots of teacher and student support
discussions groups / seminars well planned and pertinent
student enthusiasm
classroom involvement important at this level
program duration good
sociogram & reading survey interesting
2. Discuss areas needing clarification / correction.
 - [a] 5 = no comment 3 = variety of comments
greatest problem centered on logging of hours
 - [b] know about student assignments / due dates
cooperating teaching requirements
5 = no comments
3. Discuss / list any suggestion or additions you think would benefit the program.
 - [a] 2 = no comment
variety of comments = times students in school
to suggestions that students attend evening meetings
that would be beneficial
 - [b] teach one lesson in each subject
meeting w/teachers alone to discuss expectations
meeting w/o students midway BUT w/teachers
encourage students to visit other classes
stress low work load to students during this time
4. Since this is the first time we assigned a collaborative effort, your comments and feedback will be appreciated.
 - [b] 7 = no comment 2 = liked survey
5. The topics discussed were worthwhile and should be kept.
 - [a] 7 = YES 0 = NO 1 = No response
6. I would be willing to participate in
 - September, 1990 / 7 = YES 1 = NO
 - September, 1991 / 7 = YES 0 = NO

APPENDIX D

GLEN GROVE PROJECT FACT SHEET

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>STUDENTS</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
1988	#1	7	I met w/Sherrie & Irene AFTER school began STs met w/Sherrie & Irene on come when you're ready to start basis *We chose topics jointly / meetings held at GG One from this group did STg there A student heard about program and chose to do STg here
1989	#2	7	*I met w/Sherrie & Irene BEFORE school began and we planned program jointly *STs will meet w/CTs and us BEFORE school starts to discuss program and meet their CTs *Goal is for STs to start when school starts Teachers presented list of topics & we took their top choices *Any teachers who volunteered were welcome to join our sessions and discuss the issues *Meetings held at GG Of this group, three chose to do STg here [Dennis / Alice / Martha] All teachers wanted to participate the next year, except one who had a bad experience
1990	#3	9	*Met w/Sherrie & Irene BEFORE *STs and CTs met BEFORE school *Topics remained stable, but two changed at behest of teachers because of the curricular changes taking place in the district [science / social studies]

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>STUDENTS</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
1990	#3	9	*Teachers volunteered to address topics / even specials New assignment made to involve research w/student and CT [interest inventory or reading strategies inventory] Of this group, one STg next semester and one the semester after that *All teachers elected to participate again for the next year - 1991
1991	#4	9	Met w/Sherrie, Dennis, Martha, Beth, and Irene to develop a CT handbook in May for the Fall, 1991 project *Met w/Irene to bring closure to the handbook project and finalize all before the start of the year. Topics changed somewhat / added student assessment and took the content areas for one meeting. The US's will be assigned an area that will be reported on by them. *USs and CTs met before the start of school and heard all assignments and requirements at the same time. Handbook presented to students and CTs for first time. Involved course requirements, research project, school and district policies. Teacher coordinator, Beth Tsoumas, will be assisting w/meetings and ST visitations. Met w/teachers during the last week of October without the students to discuss student progress, teacher needs and concerns, the joint research project, and the handbook. Videotaped a session to view student interactions w/instructor and their CTs.

What Clinical Experience Students Would Like to Learn:

- Effective discussion. What makes it?
- How to get students involved in discussion.
- Patience in waiting for student response.
- Giving freedom and trusting independent work.
- Parents want to know of child's interactions with opposite sex.
- Games relative to subjects/resources.
- Class management and rule making/how closely stick to it?
- How to "nicely" say "Your answer isn't right."
- Does the regular teacher or the special teacher discipline if the student misbehaves during the act?
- Need to develop own discipline techniques.
- Differences between male/female teaching techniques.
- About KWL Program.
- How field trip is to be effective.
- Behavior Mod--how make it effective?
- DRTA plus other techniques.
- "How do I assert myself?"
- How to prepare before school actually starts.
- How to encourage students for homework.
- Discipline techniques.
- Special techniques for slow learners.
- About types of computer programs.
- Management techniques.
- About special needs child - How grade? homework? etc.
- "How to get community involvement?"
- How to deal with bilingual students.
- How to set up and use AV material.
- About eco systems/ science/math/lit program/special programs
- About weekly plans and lesson schedules. "Too much or to little "
- How to handle different cultures and religious beliefs.
- Bulletin board ideas.
- How to deal with child whose parent is ill.
- More writing skills.
- How to evaluate children's ability.
- How listening skills and direction giving are developed.
- Lesson development.
- How to help all children, not just a few.
- How to teach creative writing.
- How to quiet students after breaks.
- How to relieve test anxiety.
- How to motivate all students.
- How and when to listen to students.
- How to correct techniques in a lesson when one doesn't work.
- Math remediation strategies.

What Clinical Experience Students Learned:

- Cooperative learning effectiveness.
- Kids are creative.
- Don't be afraid to go off subject.
- Students will test you; make rules very clear and stick to them.
- Parents are interested in what child is doing and learning.
- Students love to compete.
- Repetition of material creates student understanding and remembering
- Students do take advantage of subs.
- Need to be prepared to teach a concept many ways to reach All students.
- There isn't enough time in a day.
- Learn student names to help with control and rapport.
- Computer understandings.
- Control without teacher presence.
- Field trip planning.
- How to help bilingual students.
- Learn student's strengths and weaknesses early because it helps planning.
- Interesting management techniques (bathroom use).
- Use of assignment books.
- Students enjoy hands-on activities and improves learning.
- Difficult to keep all students moving at same pace due to varying learning abilities.
- Clear concise directions are necessary.
- Grade are important regardless to student age.
- Students relate well to activities if they have experiences.
- Direction giving poses various problems:
 1. Lack of attention.
 2. Lack of understanding.
 3. Unclear.
- Guidelines are necessary.
- Have students call and talk with parents about problem in school.
- Don't assume students know something.
- Students love to correct teacher.
- Fifth graders enjoy praise and encouragement.
- Love to share stories and listen to others.
- Small Group work easier than Large Group.
- Some students enjoy independent learning.
- Body language good disciplining technique.
- With proper instruction students behave.
- Subject learnings.
- Fifth graders can be shy.
- Fifth graders supportive of each other.
- Fifth graders like opposite sex.
- Remember you're the role model.
- Weather affects children.
- Students have test fright.

What Clinical Experience Students Learned #2:

- Students love competition.
- Take boring lessons and turn into stories for interest.
- Bulletin boards are hard work.
- Teachers need to know about computers
- Change teaching methods for student motivation.
- Be flexible! "Teaching busiest job I know!"
- Make friends with the custodian.
- One to one really benefits some children.
- Heat influences students.
- How easily children become bored.
- Not all students are anxious to learn.
- Praising appropriate behavior does work.
- Students are individuals and must be treated as such.
- Everyday brings a new challenge.
- Test taking causes frustration and anxiety.
- Send newsletter to parents to keep them informed about school.
- Children love to talk about themselves and be listened to.
- Students love to predict and find clues in stories.
- Even if something seems fun and easy to us, the proof rests with the students.
- Students respond differently with different teachers and their own.